

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

December 11, 1964

The University Senate met at 2 pm, Friday, December 11, 1964, Acting President Colclough presiding. Inasmuch as the minutes of the previous meeting had been distributed, they were not read. Mr. Stevens moved to amend the minutes by changing the last sentence of Paragraph 4, Page 2, to read, "Discussion brought out that such a proposal was variously received and the Executive Committee was directed to study the matter further." Dr. Wise seconded the motion and the minutes were approved as amended.

Mr. Kraus, Chairman of the Executive Committee, moved the addition of Mr. Robert Willson as a member of the Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies (including Fringe Benefits.) Mr. Fox seconded the motion and it was so ordered.

Mrs. Yakobson, Chairman of the Committee on Student Relationships, presented a preliminary report on the current activities of the Committee. In its preliminary work the Committee considered the entire problem of student-faculty relations. The Committee proposes to determine the existing relations between faculty advisors and student organizations by submitting a questionnaire to the presidents of 119 student organizations and clubs. Following the findings of the survey, a meeting of the faculty advisors to student clubs will be called. Mrs. Yakobson having stressed the need for more adequate psychological resources, *services* called on Dr. E. L. Phillips, Director of the Psychological Clinic, who spoke briefly on a proposal to survey student psychological needs, particularly at the freshman level, and the functions and aims of the Clinic. On motion, seconded, the report was accepted.

Mr. Kraus stated that a constant problem since the Senate's existence is publicity, as it is necessary to reconcile the understandable interest of the students in the activities of the Senate with the Senate's own need to protect the effectiveness of its deliberations and the proper handling of unfinished business. In light of this, Mr. Kraus called upon Mr. Boyd Poush, Editor of "The Hatchet". Mr. Poush spoke briefly concerning the responsibilities and problems which he faces as editor of the student newspaper. He stated that there are many aspects of the activities of the Senate which would be a credit to publicize and thereby to apprise the student body meaningfully of this aspect of academic life. Mr. Poush concluded by urging the Senate to broaden the concepts of its publicity needs.

Mr. Wood took the floor and moved that the University Senate enter in its minutes on behalf of the faculty, its appreciation to Dr. Richard Castell for the personal interest and effort with which he organized and directed the physical examination project. Mrs. Yakobson seconded the motion and it was adopted unanimously.

Mr. Wood then proceeded to comment on the third item on the agenda -- Consideration of the New Graduate Grading System. He questioned the procedure by which the change in the graduate grading system was effected, quoting from the Faculty Organization Plan as follows:

"The University Senate, on behalf of the University Faculty, shall," with respect to matters which are of concern to more than one college, school, or division, or to the University Faculty:

(1) Formulate policy and make such other determinations and exercise supervision with respect to such programs or other matters as the President or the Board of Trustees may designate;

(2) Provide the President and the Board of Trustees with counsel on such matters as they may request;

(3) At the direction of the Assembly - or may, at the request of the Faculty of any college, school, or division or of individual Faculty members, or on its own initiative - consider any matters of concern or interest to more than one college, school, or division or to the University Faculty, and make its recommendations, or otherwise express its opinion, with respect thereto, to the Assembly, the President, or through the President to the Board of Trustees;

(4) Be the University Faculty agency to which the President initially presents information and which he consults concerning proposed changes in existing policies or promulgation of new policies.

Mr. Wood stated the change in the grading system should have been presented to the Senate for the opportunity of an expression of opinion in accordance with the requirements of the Faculty Organization Plan, thus making the Plan a more effective tool in the operation of the University. (A summary of Mr. Wood's general observations are attached to the minutes.)

Mr. Sharpe felt that Mr. Wood's were personal remarks and in accordance with correct parliamentary procedures, they should be put in the form of a motion for the purposes of action. Mr. Sharpe then moved that it be the sense of the Senate that the change in the graduate grading system should have been considered by the University Senate. Mr. LeBlanc seconded the motion. During the discussion, Mr. Eastin suggested that the matter be referred to an appropriate committee of the Senate to be selected by the Executive Committee. Mr. Kraus suggested it be referred to the Educational Policy Committee. Mr. Eastin then moved to amend as follows: The procedure by which the new grading system was established be referred by the Executive Committee to the Educational Policy Committee for study and report. The amendment was seconded and approved. The original question was then called and the motion passed.

Dr. Miller, Chairman of the Committee on Physical Facilities, gave an informal report on the activities of his committee. He reported that the Committee met with Mr. Lee Cochran, a representative of the architectural firm of Perkins and Will, which is making an architectural survey of the University facilities.

Mr. Coberly, representing the Sub-Committee on Retirement, in the absence of the Chairman, stated that the Committee had no report to make at the present time.

Mr. Kraus stated that, without objection, the Executive Committee before making a formal statement to the Senate, would further study the matter of inviting members of the Board of Trustees to Senate meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at 4 p.m.

Frederick R. Hauser

11 February 1965

Dr. Richard Castell
Director of Health Services
The George Washington University
Washington 6, D. C.

Dear Dr. Castell:

At its December 11, 1964 meeting, the University Senate unanimously voted to make a part of the minutes of the meeting its feeling of appreciation to you for the personal interest and effort with which you organized and directed the physical examination project at the University.

It is with a deep sense of gratitude that the Secretary on behalf of the entire Senate conveys this message to you personally.

Very truly yours,

Frederick R. Houser
Secretary
University Senate

Attachment #1 - Remarks of Mr. Wood concerning the procedure by which the change in the graduate grading system was effected.

"My concern with the change in graduate grading terminology is not primarily with the substance of the change but with the procedure followed in making the change. This concern, in turn, arises from the strong personal commitment I feel to a continuing effort to make the University Senate a more effective and beneficial instrument in the service of the University. My remarks are directed toward that end and are not intended to reproach any individuals.

The problem of achieving a more effective Senate may be analyzed, among other ways, by asking the questions: (a) What can every faculty member contribute to this effort? (b) What more can members of the Senate contribute? (c) What about the Senate's Executive Committee? (d) In what ways can the University's Administration promote the useful functioning of the Senate? Each of these questions is doubtless worthy of serious study and periodic reexamination. There is not time in this meeting to deal with these questions in any comprehensive way. I do offer in most brief form the following suggestions which seem to me among the answers which might be given.

Members of the Faculty should recognize that the Senate is a representative body -- the Faculties' representative organization -- established by it and by action of the Board of Trustees to study and to speak for the faculties and for groups within the faculties on any matters of concern to them except those matters involving only one school or division. Faculty members should take an active interest in the proceedings of the Senate and should bring to the attention of the senate matters and viewpoints which they feel should be considered.

Many members of the Senate can increase their contributions by participating more in Senate discussions. Silence often gives consent but may also be a manifestation of suppressed dissent. Probably the influence of the Senate will more often be exerted through an informal evaluation of the consensus than through specific resolutions voted upon. And even in the case of formal resolutions, the views of the representatives of the different divisions should be known and considered before the vote is taken.

Perhaps the most important regular responsibility of the Executive Committee is to prepare the agenda for meetings. Every effort should be made to place on the agenda important items which can command the interest of the Senate and of the Faculty and which offer opportunities to the Senate to make constructive contributions to the welfare of the University.

To the Administration I commend careful attention to the functions of the Senate as stated in its official charter, the Faculty Organization Plan. To all of these functions. But today I point out these two quotations from the section of the Plan stating the functions of the Senate:

"(3) -- Consider any matters of concern or interest to more than one college, school, or division or to the University Faculty and to make its recommendations, or otherwise express its opinion, with respect thereto, to the Assembly, the President, or through the President to the Board of Trustees."

"(4) -- Be the University Faculty agency to which the President initially presents information and which he consults concerning proposed changes in existing policies or promulgation of new policies."

In conclusion, and to focus these remarks on the subject listed in the agenda to which I was to address myself, I propose that the procedure followed in instituting the change in the form in which graduate grades are to be reported was incorrect. This is a matter of concern to more than one division of the University, a matter which has been shown obviously to be of concern to the Faculty, and therefore one which should have been brought before the Senate. That the Senates' Executive Committee did not on its own initiative put it on the agenda of a Senate meeting may have been (and was in my case) because of ignorance that such a change was under active consideration. My hope is that in the future the Administration will inform the Senate or its Executive Committee of such proposed innovations at the earliest practical time and, if at all possible, before they are put into effect.

My even greater hope is that all of the foregoing remarks will have made a constructive contribution to the evolution of the University Senate."

Memorandum on Survey of Freshman Class and Committee on Student Personal Services

November 30, 1964

This memorandum expresses a common concern emerging from a series of monthly meetings of the Director of the Psychological Clinic, staff of Dean of Men and Dean of Women's offices and the Religious Advisors, people who come in contact most often with students who desire or need counseling services. In informal discussions about symptoms of personal difficulties, referral procedures, help available in the Psychological Clinic, Deans' offices and Religious Advisors, and relationship with the medical center, two needs seemed to be felt most strongly:

- 1) the need for more precise knowledge of the student body, its background, and the kinds of problems existing*, and
- 2) the need for a recognized and active Committee on Student Personal Services (?)

With regard to the first need, Dr. Phillips has suggested* and the group has supported the idea that a survey of an entering class might provide us with data about the needs of the student body so that services might be planned for which will more adequately meet these needs. Suggestions about the kinds of information which would be helpful have been sought. Discussions about the funds to carry out such a survey have been initiated. It is at this point that we heard of a suggestion made in the Senate Committee on Student-Faculty Relations, viz. that a personality inventory of some sort be given as part of admissions procedure. It is our suggestion that, at this time, the matter be presented to the Senate and an appropriate steering committee be appointed to continue the plans for such a survey.

With regard to the second need, it seems that several needed functions could be met by a Committee on Student Personal Services: supervision of the survey, liaison between the various groups concerned with personal problems of students, publicity about the Psychological Clinic among faculty and academic and administrative officers, formalizing of study and training programs for personnel, support of and advice to (?) the Director of the Psychological Clinic, and general championing of needs of students in the area of residential, psychological, medical, and religious services.

Robert G. Jones, Chairman
Committee on Religious Life

*see his attached memorandum.

November 25, 1964

1. The problem of student adjustment (or student mental health) is a pervasive and pressing problem. We need data on an up-coming Freshman class in order to develop first, some reliable descriptions of the presenting problems students have in this area; second, some basis for planning measures to insure University help for such students; third, some basis for later follow-up as to how reliable the descriptive measures might be and how useful they are for providing guidance for the second sub-point.
2. In an article in Atlantic (about July 1964), under the general topic of "Mental Health of Americans," a Stanford University professor estimated that up to 40% of the student body needed some kind of help during the university years. This figure may be high, but even if we cut it in half, we are confronted by a considerable number needing some kind of explicit help.
3. Services that are called for are those that fall in-between the casual or passing conversation with a professor dealing with a simple and/or limited problem, on the one hand, and those problems requiring hospitalization. The vast majority of students need help with three areas: Studying-concentrating-use-of-time-ability-resources; help with emotional and social problems that require some therapy, best described as Short-Term Therapy (which we have been doing in the Clinic, training graduate students for, and for which we have research data); and students who are academic probationary cases (for one or more of five reasons) and require help in re-aligning their goals, changing majors or switching from one school to another (within or without the University).
4. A research program on an up-coming Freshman class could be financed through some existing funding resources. This would involve University-wide planning, but could be pivoted from the Clinic as a project we could administer and carry through on a 1-4 year basis. Such a project would be based on the accumulation of data from several areas of information from students, and might be conducted during Freshman Week on a sample of from 100-200 students. Such information would include: Name, Age, Sex, SAT Scores, Intact-Broken Home, H. S. Rank, Etc., and would include no more than 2-3 appropriate questionnaires dealing with (preferably) general adjustment, and educational interest (respectively, the MMPI, and the Strong V.I.B.).
5. Carrying out such a project would involve the use of a computer. I have already discussed the purchase or rental of a computer of a given type (together with a Key Punch Machine) with Dean Bright and Mr. Johnson of the Comptroller's Office. Such a machine (or machines) might be gotten under the aegis of the proposed study of the Freshman Class.

E. Lakin Phillips, Director
Psychological Clinic

Remarks to the University Senate, December 11, 1964

The Senate Committee on Physical Facilities held an organizational meeting on November 12. At that time the Chairman reported on his contact with the architectural firm of Perkins and Will, which is making an architectural survey of the University facilities. This contact had been made at the suggestion of the Executive Committee of the Senate and with the cooperation of the Office of the President. A meeting was arranged for the morning of November 24 at the offices of Perkins and Will. The entire committee was present at that time. We were briefed on the activities of Perkins and Will in relation to the University by Mr. Lee Cochran. He expressed the view that the purposes of a university were academic service, cultural service (such as is provided here by Lisner Auditorium), community service (as provided by the University Hospital), national and international relationships, and research activities. In regard to academic activities he stated that the aim of The George Washington University was to maintain a ratio of graduate to undergraduate students of 1 to 1. According to him the University plans to continue this ratio by pressing graduate school growth as the number of undergraduate students increases. Emphasis would be placed on increasing the full time graduate students, aiming at a ratio of 65% full time to 35% part time graduate students. He stated that the growth in the number of students at the University is not expected to exceed 25% in the next 10 years. This appears to be a consciously limited growth. The present University land holdings could house more than a 25% increase, i.e., about 2800 students. Under present zoning regulations the University could expand to a total area of 5.5 million square feet. The University policy is to house the increased number of students in its own dormitory facilities. Vice President Herzog noted that this would be achieved mainly by conversion of existing apartments in the University area. He stated that buildings on University property can be built through the College Housing Act, but that the University must equip such buildings.

- 2 -

Mr. Cochran then led a discussion on the necessity of increasing the teaching use of present physical facilities. He also stated that the survey of the University showed that faculty office space is generally skimpy. As to parking policy Perkins and Will proposed a plan which would peripheralize automobiles coming to the University by means of parking lots and parking buildings so as to minimize the number of automobiles in the actual campus areas. Mr. Herzog interjected here that provisions for parking related to new building construction must be included in the planning of such buildings under the zoning regulation.

The Committee was then shown a number of proposed 10 year growth plans for the University. These were in the form of schematic drawings proposing location of present and proposed buildings in the area bounded by 24th Street, Pennsylvania Avenue, 19th Street and Virginia Avenue. They included proposals for closing a number of streets within these boundaries to vehicular traffic and the establishment of areas limited to pedestrian use. Following examination of these plans the Committee learned to its surprise that the obligation of Perkins and Will to the University was limited to submission of a boundary plan for the University which must be submitted to the National Park and Planning Commission by December 31. At that point the meeting was closed.

Frank N. Miller
Chairman, Senate
Committee on Physical Facilities